

R E M A R K S

In the above-identified Office Action, several issues were raised as to matters of form. In response, Applicants have attempted to remedy each of these issues.

The Drawings

The Drawings filed with this divisional application were objected to as being difficult to read. Accordingly, attached hereto are replacement drawings which have the identical content as the originally filed drawings, wherefore Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the Drawings.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

All of the claims were rejected in view of their requirement for a “scenario file” on the ground that the meaning of that term is unclear. In reply, attention is directed to page 1 of the Substitute Specification, commencing at [0002], wherein it states:

[0002] Recently, a multimedia presentation system that reproduces multimedia material files such as a still image, a motion image (or animation), a voice, a character, and the like, according to a sequence described in a scenario file that controls the multimedia material files in a time series, has received attention.

Then, on page 2, it is stated:

[0004] Next, a general use of this system will be explained.

[0005] Multimedia materials, such as an image, a voice, a character, and the like, to be used in a multimedia presentation are collected and filed by the PC 111. The filed multimedia materials, or material files, are edited by a dedicated authoring tool for the multimedia presentation system. More specifically, icons representing the voice, the still image, the motion image, and the character are dragged and dropped (i.e., in a drag-and-drop operation), and pasted according to a time base. Then a scenario file, which is written to describe a sequence for displaying the material

files, is formed on the basis of information obtained from the pasting.

Applicants respectfully submit that these portions of the Specification provide a clear explanation of the term “scenario file”, wherein it will be appreciated that a scenario file controls material files, which may be reproduced in a presentation form, and that such control is performed in a time series.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 101

The claims were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-stationary subject matter. This rejection is traversed on several grounds. First, the claims of the parent application, written in a similar format, were issued in a patent, wherefore those claims were recognized by the U.S. PTO as being in good form with respect to 35 U.S.C. 101. Next, a review of the MPEP, commencing at §2106 IV B 2(b) ii) gives several examples of permissible language which is similar in form to that used in the claims of this application. Finally, it is noted that each of the independent claims has been amended to clarify, even further, a use and result of the present invention, wherein the scenario file controls the material files to be reproduced in a presentation form. Accordingly, the above-referenced language of all of the independent claims now defines a practical application and useful result as required in the Office Action.

For these reasons, it is believed that the claims should not be rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Double Patenting

Applicants acknowledge the double patenting rejection, but propose to put off the determination of the necessity for a Terminal Disclaimer until the scope of allowed

claims is determined in this application. However, Applicants believe that the claims are now allowable.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
John A. Krause
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 580135v1